

Pushed further a reporter asked him if the leaker should be fired. And he answered, "If a source leaked information of this nature, yes."

Republican National Committee Chairman Ed Gillespie said, I do not believe it would be hard for President Bush to ask the person to walk the plank. The fact that Karl Rove remains at the White House speaks volumes. It is certainly not the way the White House should operate.

The White House should not aid and abet those within it in exposing CIA agents who work for this country and defend it to danger, and therefore it is time for Karl Rove to walk the plank.

#### DISCOURAGING JOB NUMBERS

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday we got another employment report showing that American workers are losing out. Payroll employment growth was disappointing once again. Only 146,000 jobs were added in June, when market forecasters were expecting between 175,000 and 200,000.

Though the unemployment rate edged down, it was not because people are reentering the labor force. There still seems to be a great deal of hidden unemployment. Compared to the start of the recession in early 2001, participation in the labor force now is actually 1.2 percent lower.

A smaller proportion of the working age population has a job now compared to then. Worst of all, inflation is still outpacing wages, and the distribution of earnings is increasingly imbalanced.

The signs are clear, workers are being shortchanged in this economic recovery, but this administration is standing idly by.

#### RESTORE VETERANS HEALTH FUNDING

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the House should not recess this week until we have addressed the VA health care crisis. As we speak, health care services for veterans all across America are either being delayed or cut because of a billion dollar plus shortfall in VA health care programs.

Cutting veterans health care during a time of war is inexcusable and wrong. Unfortunately, 12 days ago the House leadership refused to support the billion and a half emergency funding bill passed by the Senate 96 to 0 on a bipartisan basis.

We could have had help already on its way to our veterans. It has been 8 days since Members of Congress gave patriotic speeches on July 4 honoring the service of our veterans. Those speeches are fine. Veterans deserve our support with our deeds not just our words.

Given the House leadership caused the VA health care crisis in the first

place by underfunding, seriously underfunding health care programs for veterans over the last 2 years, they have a moral obligation to bring and pass through this House and send to the President this week an emergency funding bill for veterans. Our veterans deserve no less.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS UNDER NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 804) to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the national flood insurance program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 804

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS UNDER NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Chapter I of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS

"SEC. 1324. Assistance provided under a program under this title for flood mitigation activities (including any assistance provided under the mitigation pilot program under section 1361A, any assistance provided under the mitigation assistance program under section 1366, and any funding provided under section 1323) with respect to a property shall not be considered income or a resource of the owner of the property when determining eligibility for or benefit levels under any income assistance or resource-tested program that is funded in whole or in part by an agency of the United States or by appropriated funds of the United States."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER).

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was just last year that the United States Congress acted to reform the flood assistance programs of this country to ensure that those who engaged in abusive practices and thereby were over assessing the program for repetitive flood losses would no longer avail themselves of that inappropriate opportunity.

Accordingly, as the House passed legislation, there was an unintended consequence, however, pursuant to a ruling by the IRS which found that there was no technical or legislative basis on which to exempt payments made from the flood assistance program for the purposes of an individual qualifying for additional governmental assistance.

I will translate that into something that is more appropriate. If, for example, a person were to accept an assistance mitigation payment to reduce the probability of future flooding, that income could then be counted and disqualify that person from receiving food stamps, aid to dependent children, perhaps Social Security, other health care assistance. And that, of course, was not the intent of the legislation as passed.

In fact, under the provisions of the Stafford Act, all other emergency assistance granted by FEMA does not count toward qualifying individuals for governmental assistance, or for that matter, as income qualifying under the IRS for taxable liability.

The reason for this policy position is quite clear, the whole goal of the effort was to incent people to make changes necessary to their property so they would no longer call on the Federal Government for flood mitigation assistance.

In one instance, an individual who was to receive significant mitigation funding, had he accepted it, would have put him far over the qualifying limits for even his Social Security benefits. That is not the outcome that one would want to see as a result of trying to assist a person with flooding problems.

Coming on the heels of Hurricane Dennis and many events across the Gulf Coast of the past few months, it is now clear this action is not only appropriate but necessary and does not violate precedent nor other actions of the Congress with regard to other assistance programs.

For these reasons, I feel the adoption of H.R. 804 is highly appropriate and responsive to the needs of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a very important improvement to what was a very important piece of legislation.

At a time when people wonder about whether or not we are able to go forward, it ought to be noted clearly there

are strong ideological and partisan differences over some issues, as there should be in a democracy, but we have been able, from time to time, to work together on things where there is a consensus of common sense.

In this particular instance, the underlying legislation here was one which was strongly supported by a coalition of environmentalists and taxpayer groups who had a common understanding that in effect encouraging people to continue to rebuild in areas that were going to be flooded made no sense from either the environmental or the taxpayer perspective.

There was also an unusually fruitful bipartisan collaboration that brought us this bill. Our former colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), a senior member of the Committee on Financial Services, worked very closely with a continuing Member, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and they did an excellent job of putting this piece of legislation together.

And we now, having enacted the legislation, encounter something that was unanticipated. This would clean it up. It would make a very good piece of legislation better.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for his cooperative work in this matter.

It has been bipartisan. I think it achieves a worthwhile policy goal, and I express my appreciation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he would consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) who will be my last speaker.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this and the leadership of our friend, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), who, as was mentioned along with our colleague, the former Member, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bereuter), will ironically will be in Washington D.C. this week.

I cannot think of a better gift for Mr. Bereuter, a recognition for his long service to this House and to the people of Nebraska and the country, to do this important clarification. I could not agree more with my friend from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) how important it is to clarify the intent of this legislation.

The whole thrust of it was to, in some cases, eliminate potential abuse of the program. But more than an isolated case of abuse here and there, there were a number of people who were trapped in a pattern of flood and having to repair and did not know how to get out of it.

And the bill was designed, as my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), pointed out, in cooperation with environmental groups, with taxpayer groups, with industry, the insurance industry, home building

industry, financial institutions, to try and make sure that we did the right job for both the taxpayer and people who are in flood-prone areas.

The National Flood Insurance Program is critical to the lives of over 4 million policyholders. And many of the people eligible for flood-mitigation assistance under the flood insurance program were caught in this cycle of flooding and rebuilding and flooding again that could be ended with mitigation assistance.

Now, I support strongly this legislation to remove a disincentive for people living in flood-prone areas to accept the mitigation grant that will help prepare them for floods before they happen, reduce damage for future floods, and save lives for future disasters. Everybody wins if this program works right.

The policyholders win because, as we pointed out, as the legislation was moving forward, when we have the legislation, only 1 percent of the property owners were responsible for 25 percent of the flood-loss dollars.

By reducing the magnitude of this repetitive flood loss program, we were able to make a huge difference to a wide range of people. The Association of State Flood Plain Managers estimates that avoiding just one 10 percent increase will save the 4.4 million policyholders about \$175 million each year.

Taxpayers will win if the mitigation program works right, because the flood insurance payments are the tip of the iceberg. Because there are many, many people in harm's way, who get part of their relief from flood insurance, but we have disaster plains on the Federal Government that far exceed them.

By making this program work right, we will save taxpayers money time and time again. I appreciate the hard work the Financial Services Committee has done in trying to fine-tune the flood insurance program, continuing hearings to make sure that it works right, and here, clearing up any ambiguity to make sure that we take any disincentive for using the mitigation grants and solve that problem to make sure that people take advantage of moving out of harm's way, saving money, enhancing the environment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) who is a strong advocate of our flood insurance program.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank, on behalf of my constituents, many of whom have to have flood insurance, I would like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) for introducing H.R. 804.

As we all know from watching the television, hurricane season has arrived again. Residents of the Gulf and east coast face familiar anxieties associated with the hurricane season. They begin to cross their fingers and hope

their home will not be devastated by nature's wrath and that their belongings will not be washed away.

What residents should not have to be crossing their fingers over is whether the government is going to hit them with additional liabilities after they receive help. Yet, under the National Flood Insurance Program today, that is exactly what happens. The IRS considers NFIP grants as income which means any person on means-tested assistance loses. Residents who accept NFIP grants after their homes are destroyed by floods are then slapped with reduced government benefits such as health care, education or even nutrition assistance.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) for introducing this legislation that prevents agencies other than the IRS from considering NFIP grants as income and I implore my colleagues to support this bill. Those who have been hit by floods should not have to choose between NFIP assistance and food stamps.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to all Members who have had an interest and role in perfecting this legislation. Merely for the purposes of establishing in the record as we close the chapter I believe on the reform of the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program, but every dollar of benefit paid is generated by premiums of flood insurance paid into the fund by home and property owners. It is a program which pays out benefits, and at any time, if there has been an advance of funding by the Federal Government when funds on hand have been deficient to pay existing claims, all dollars have been repaid plus interest over the life of the program. So in fact it is a program that functions in an efficient taxpayer-responsible manner.

And with the adjustments made over the past 18 months to the program, I hope it brings to an end further Congressional review and oversight of the important flood assistance programs as now constructed.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the revised cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, May 11, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed revised cost estimate for H.R. 804, a bill to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the National Flood Insurance Program. This estimate supersedes our original estimate that was transmitted on March 31, 2005.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Kathleen Fitzgerald.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,  
Director.

Enclosure.

H.R. 804—A bill to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the National Flood Insurance Program

If H.R. 804 were enacted, payments made under the National Flood Insurance Program for flood mitigation activities would not be

counted as income or resources when determining eligibility for any federal means-tested program. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) awards grants to states and communities, which in turn distribute funds to individuals and businesses for activities that reduce the risk of repetitive flood damage to buildings. Data from FEMA show that the average approved award is about \$75,000.

CBO expects that enacting this bill would increase the number of persons eligible for certain means-tested programs including Food Stamps and Medicaid. Currently, flood mitigation grants are counted as income or resources, by these programs and make some people ineligible for benefits or reduce the amount of their benefit. (Certain other FEMA grants are already excluded from income for benefit-eligibility purposes.) Based on data from FEMA on the number of flood mitigation grants awarded since fiscal year 1997 CBO estimates that the increase in the number of people newly eligible for these programs as a result of this legislation would be small and that any increase in direct spending for them would not be significant. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

H.R. 804 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and any increased spending by states for public benefits would be minimal.

This revised estimate supersedes the estimate that CBO transmitted on this bill on March 31, 2005. Based on new information on both the number of flood mitigation grants and how they are distributed, CBO has lowered its estimate of the number of instances where individual families receive such grants. We previously estimated a cost of about \$1 million a year, but now estimate that such costs would be less than \$500,000 a year.

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Kathleen FitzGerald (for federal costs), Leo Lex (for the impact on state, local, and tribal governments), and Paige Piper/Bach (for the private-sector impact). This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OXLEY: I am writing concerning H.R. 804, a bill "[t]o exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the national flood insurance program," which is scheduled for floor consideration on Tuesday, July 12, 2005.

The bill is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means because it would exclude certain flood insurance mitigation payments from consideration for purposes of determining eligibility for and amount of benefits under certain means-tested programs. As a result the bill could affect eligibility for and benefit levels under certain programs under the Committee's jurisdiction. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 804, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this mat-

ter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2005.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 804, a bill "to exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the flood insurance program."

I recognize that specifying the treatment of these payments for purposes of determining eligibility for any income assistance or resource-tested programs could affect eligibility for and benefit levels under certain programs, including those under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I appreciate your cooperation in developing an amended version of the bill, thereby permitting its consideration under suspension of the rules. This cooperation does not prejudice your Committee in any way with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I intend to place this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record. Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,  
Chairman.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman BAKER's effort on crafting this piece of legislation and Chairman MIKE OXLEY's diligence in seeing this bill to the floor.

H.R. 804, introduced on February 15, 2005, will prevent federal agencies that administer means-tested or income-tested benefits from considering NFIP mitigation grants as income. H.R. 804 is necessary due to an IRS ruling in July 2004 that such grants must be reported as income for tax purposes. This IRS ruling has caused significant uncertainty in the administration of the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. Anecdotal information has revealed that a significant number of homeowners have refused mitigation offers not only due to the fear of a potential tax liability, but also the potential for other unknown liabilities imposed by other federal government agencies. These penalties could include the loss of certain federal education, nutrition and health care benefits. H.R. 804 eliminates the potential for additional penalties by preventing federal government agencies (other than the IRS) from considering NFIP flood mitigation grants as income.

The precedent for this exception is found in the Stafford Act, which explicitly states that any disaster or pre-disaster mitigation payments made to homeowners under that Act are not to be considered as income by any federal agency administering a means- or income-tested benefit. By incorporating this language in the National Flood Insurance Act, H.R. 804 will resolve any additional uncertainty by likewise preventing federal agencies from considering flood mitigation grants as income.

Floods have been, and continue to be, one of the most destructive and costly natural hazards to our nation. In the aftermath of Hurricane Dennis this past weekend, I fear many communities in the South and Midwest will wit-

ness this unrelenting power firsthand as the tropical depression continues to unload heavy, flooding rains inland.

During this past year, there have been three major floods in my district in eastern Ohio. All three of these incidents qualified for federal relief granted by the President. Recent flooding in January of this year resulted in historic levels in several local dams, and, in Tuscarawas County, three communities were forced to evacuate, which displaced 7,000 people. I was able to witness this devastation firsthand when I toured damaged properties in both Tuscarawas and Guernsey counties. Also, I am planning to hold a field hearing in Tuscarawas County next month to continue the Subcommittee's oversight of the National Flood Insurance Program.

The National Flood Insurance Program is a valuable tool in addressing the losses incurred throughout this country due to floods. It assures that businesses and families have access to affordable flood insurance that would not be available on the open market.

Prior to the passage of the National Flood Insurance Act in 1968, insurance companies generally did not offer coverage for flood disasters because of the high risks involved. Today, almost 20,000 communities participate in the national flood insurance program. More than 90 insurance companies sell and service flood policies. There are approximately 4.4 million policies covering a total of \$620 billion.

Last year's Flood Insurance Reform Act achieved significant reforms to this important federal program and I look forward to hearing from all of our witnesses today as we discuss FEMA's implementation of its flood mapping policy, as well as determine whether new reforms and initiatives are in order to complement the work we accomplished last year. I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 804, a bill that would exclude from consideration as income certain payments under the national flood insurance program.

This bill was introduced by my friend and colleague from Louisiana, Mr. RICHARD BAKER, and was reported from the Financial Services Committee, by voice vote, on March 16, 2005. I am pleased to see it on the floor of the House this morning and am confident that it will receive favorable consideration.

H.R. 804 is a common-sense bill that will prevent Federal agencies administering means- or income-tested benefits from considering National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) mitigation grants as income. Successful distribution of these mitigation grants is vitally important to the financial soundness of the NFIP, since they help prevent costly repetitive flood losses by allowing homeowners to elevate their properties or take other measures to prevent future flooding.

In July 2004, an IRS ruling maintained that these mitigation grants must be reported to the IRS as income for tax purposes. As a result, some homeowners have refused mitigation offers out of a concern that mitigation funds could increase their reported income to levels that would result in a loss of Federal education, nutrition and health care benefits. Other homeowners fear potential tax liabilities.

We in the Congress have put in a great deal of work over the past several years on the repetitive flood loss issue, culminating in the

Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. This Act expanded the use of mitigation grants and requires homeowners to participate in flood mitigation programs. Unfortunately, we are now faced with a situation where affected homeowners face the loss of benefits such as subsidized school lunches, Federal education grants and Medicaid. That is just not right.

H.R. 804 removes this concern and will allow flood mitigation grants to work as intended. I urge my colleagues to help protect homeowners throughout our Nation by supporting final passage of H.R. 804.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 804, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NASA AND JPL 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 68) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 68

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "NASA and JPL 50th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act".

#### SEC. 2. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—In commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$50 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 \$50 gold coins which shall—

(A) weigh 33.931 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 32.7 millimeters; and

(C) contain 1 troy ounce of fine gold.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 \$1 coins of each of the 9 designs specified in section 3(a)(3)(B), which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

#### SEC. 3. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 50 years of exemplary and unparalleled achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year "2008"; and

(C) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum", and such other inscriptions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the designs of the coins.

(3) COIN IMAGES.—

(A) \$50 COINS.—

(i) OBERVERSE.—The obverse of the \$50 coins issued under this Act shall bear an image of the sun.

(ii) REVERSE.—The reverse of the \$50 coins issued under this Act shall bear a design emblematic of the sacrifice of the United States astronauts who lost their lives in the line of duty over the course of the space program.

(iii) EDGE.—The edge of the \$50 coins issued under this Act shall bear the names and dates of the spacecraft missions on which United States astronauts lost their lives over the course of the space program.

(iv) HIGH RELIEF.—The design and inscriptions on the obverse and reverse of the \$50 coins issued under this Act shall be in high relief.

(B) \$1 COINS.—

(i) OBERVERSE.—The obverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act shall bear 9 different designs each of which shall consist of an image of 1 of the 9 planets of the solar system, including Earth.

(ii) REVERSE.—The reverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act shall bear different designs each of which shall be emblematic of discoveries and missions of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory to the planet depicted on the obverse of the coin, subject to the following requirements:

(I) EARTH COIN.—The reverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act which bear an image of the Earth on the obverse shall bear images emblematic of, and honoring, the discoveries and missions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Mercury, Gemini and Space Shuttle missions and other manned Earth-orbiting missions, and the Apollo missions to the Moon.

(II) JUPITER COIN.—The reverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act which bear an image of the planet Jupiter on the obverse shall include a scientifically accurate depiction of the Galilean moon Europa and depict both a past and future mission to Europa.

(III) SATURN COIN.—The reverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act which bear an image of the planet Saturn on the obverse shall include a scientifically accurate depiction of the moon Titan and depict both a past and a future mission to Titan.

(IV) PLUTO COIN.—The reverse of the \$1 coins issued under this Act which bear an image of the planet Pluto on the obverse shall include a design that is emblematic of telescopic exploration of deep space by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the ongoing search for Earth-like planets orbiting other stars.

(iii) EDGE.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the extent practicable, the edge of each \$1 coin should bear the names and dates or range of dates of missions or mission types to the planet depicted on the obverse.

(4) REALISTIC AND SCIENTIFICALLY ACCURATE DEPICTIONS.—The images for the designs of coins issued under this Act shall be selected

on the basis of the realism and scientific accuracy of the images and on the extent to which the images are reminiscent of the dramatic and beautiful artwork on coins of the so-called "Golden Age of Coinage" in the United States, at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, with the participation of such noted sculptors and medallist artists as James Earle Fraser, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, Victor David Brenner, Adolph A. Weinman, Charles E. Barber, and George T. Morgan.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coin Advisory Committee.

#### SEC. 4. SYMBOLIC INCLUSION OF METALS THAT HAVE FLOWN IN SPACE.

(a) COLLECTION.—Each Federal agency and instrumentality of the United States, including the Department of Defense, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, that has in its possession any craft, or any part of a craft, that flew in space shall—

(1) retrieve such gold, silver, copper, and other metals that the Director of the United States Mint determines are appropriate for use in the production of any coins under this Act, from such craft or part, that can be retrieved without harming any such craft or part that may be of continuing use for its original purpose or for research, or whose preservation is appropriate for historical purposes; and

(2) deposit such metals so retrieved with the Director of the United States Mint.

(b) USE OF METALS IN PRODUCTION OF COINS.—Any metals deposited with the Director of the United States Mint under subsection (a) shall be used in the production of the coins struck under this Act by blending such metals with other metal necessary for the production of such coins so that all of the coins produced under this Act will contain some proportion of the bullion obtained from craft or parts of crafts that flew in space in an amount appropriate for the types and denominations of the coins and the amount of metals so deposited.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—It is the sense of the Congress that each Federal agency and instrumentality of the United States which retrieves any metals in accordance with subsection (a) should maintain accurate and complete records of the retrieval and deposit of any such metals sufficient to allow the Director of the United States Mint—

(1) to provide certificates of authenticity with coins issued under this Act that some proportion of the contents of such coins were obtained from craft or parts of crafts that flew in space; and

(2) to package with each issued coin a list of the missions in which such craft flew in space.

(d) PRIVATE SPACECRAFT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal agency and instrumentality of the United States that has or continues to conduct space-related missions shall, in addition to the efforts described in subsection (a), make efforts to secure and retrieve from privately-held craft that has flown in space such gold, silver, copper and other metals that the Director of the United States Mint determines are appropriate for use in the production of any coins under this Act.

(2) RECORDKEEPING.—It is the sense of the Congress that each Federal agency and instrumentality of the United States which retrieves any metals pursuant to paragraph (1)